



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,684	11/14/2003	Amir Peles	RADW 20.043	2852
26304 7590 06/26/2007 KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			EXAMINER KLIMACH, PAULA W	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,684

Applicant(s)

PELES, AMIR

Examiner

Paula W. Klimach

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 04/09/07. The amendment filed on 04/09/07 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently pending claims are 1-35.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 04/09/07 have been fully considered.

Applicant argued Stewart does not teach, the newly added claim language, receiving a request from a client to a server to receive an object. This is found persuasive. The newly cited art teaches the deficiencies of Stewart.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-14, 17-29, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. (6,901,519) in view of Frazier et al (6,901,428 B1).

In reference to claims 1, 10, 13, 20, 25, 28, and 33 Stewart discloses a network is protected from e-mail viruses through the use of a sacrificial server (Abstract). The Gatekeeper parses and identifies a file extension associated with said received request (column 3 lines 45-48). Stewart further discloses comparing said identified file extension with said pre-stored list of

Art Unit: 2135

trusted file extensions (column 3 lines 45-56); and forwarding the received request to an inspection gateway upon not finding a successful match (column 3 line 57 to column 4 line 47).

Although Stewart discloses receiving a file, Stewart does not teach receiving a request from a client to a server to receive an object.

Frazier discloses receiving a request from a client to a server to receive an object (part 310 Figure 4, in combination with column 2 lines 17-28, and column 2 lines 55-65).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve an object from the server as disclosed in Frazier in the system of Stewart. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the system Frazier would allow convenient display and other presentation mechanism provided for some of the relatively complex data types of object relational database systems (Frazier column 1 lines 33-37).

In reference to claims 2 and 27 wherein upon finding a successful match in step (c) forwarding said received request to said server (Fig. 2 parts 207-208 and Fig. 2A part 218).

In reference to claims 5, 12, 14, 21, 26, and 29 a method further comprising the steps of: receiving a reply from said server (reply from sacrificial server; column 4 lines 63-67); parsing said reply to identify a content-type of an object contained in said reply (column 5 lines 12-15); comparing said identified content-type with said pre-stored list of trusted content-types (column 3 lines 46-56); and upon finding a successful match, forwarding said reply to said client (Fig. 1 part 106).

In reference to claim 6 wherein said request is a HTTP request (column 3 lines 34-36).

In reference to claims 7, 11, 17, and 22 wherein communication session between said client and said server is a TCP/IP session (column 3 lines 34-36).

In reference to claims 9, 19, and 24 wherein said security switch communicates with said server over a network, and said network is any of the following: local area network (LAN), wide area network (WAN), metropolitan area network (MAN), wireless network, cellular network, or the Internet (Figure 1).

In reference to claims 8, 18, and 23 wherein said object is any of the following: an image file, an audio file, a video file, an active server page file, a script file, or a markup language-based file (column 3 lines 35-45).

Claims 3-4, 15-16, 30-31, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Frazier as applied in claims 1, 10, 13, 20, 25, 28, and 33 and further in view of Stallings (Network and Internetwork Security).

In reference to claims 3, 15, 30, and 34, Stewart does not expressly disclose steps (a) through (d) are performed upon verifying that said client is an authorized client.

Stallings discloses a method wherein said steps (a) through (d) are performed upon verifying that said client is an authorized client (page 90).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to verify that the client is an authorized client as in Stallings in the system of Stewart. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would reduce replay and therefore masquerade by devices (Stallings page 91).

In reference to claims 4, 16, 31, and 35 Stewart does not expressly disclose steps (a) through (d) are performed upon verifying that said server is an authorized server.

Stallings discloses a method wherein said steps (a) through (d) are performed upon verifying that said server is an authorized server (page 90).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to verify that the client is an authorized client as in Stallings in the system of Stewart. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would reduce replay and therefore masquerade by devices (Stallings page 91).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paula W. Klimach whose telephone number is (571) 272-3854. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thr 9:30 a.m to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PWK
Thursday, June 21, 2007


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT
TECHNOLOGY CENTER